

Development needs and intervention programme among resettled communities in Taraba state: A correlational analysis

Angyu Daniel Awudu

Department of Political Science, Federal University of Education, Zaria

Corresponding author: awududaniels@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.33003/ijmass-2025v1i2.18.32-42>

Abstract

This study examines the correlation between the basic development needs of resettled internally displaced communities and the Fadama-III-AF-II intervention programme in Taraba State, which has faced multiple patterns of humanitarian crises due to Boko Haram insurgency and ethno-religious conflicts. Reports from 2015 to 2017 indicate that Taraba State had 63,272 IDPs resulting from conflicts between 2010 and 2015. In response, the Federal Government launched the North East Food Security and Livelihood Emergency Support Project (NEFSLESP) under Fadama III-AF-II, benefiting 39 resettled communities in Taraba State. A 3-part questionnaire was administered to 338 respondents from 26 purposively sampled communities, with each community having 13 respondents since they all had equal beneficiaries (40 each). Data were quantitatively analyzed using descriptive statistics, and the hypothesis was tested using the correlation coefficient at a 0.05 alpha significance level. Findings showed that the Fadama III-AF-II intervention was demand-driven through needs assessment, leading to the identification of basic development needs, the development of a Community Action Plan, and the delivery of intervention packages. The study revealed a significant correlation between the identified needs and the provided intervention packages, with a Pearson Correlation coefficient of 0.604 and a P value of 0.018. The study recommends that the state government design intervention programmes to address housing, healthcare, and school rehabilitation in resettled communities, as these needs were not covered by the Fadama III-AF-II intervention.

Keywords: Development, Fadama, IDPs, intervention, needs, resettlement

1. Introduction

While Boko Haram escalated and drew national and international attention, Taraba State faced not only the spread of Boko Haram attacks and served as a refuge for victims from Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe States but also experienced internal violent conflicts that devastated people and their livelihoods. Between 2010 and 2015, local governments such as Wukari, Ibi, Donga, Takum, Bali, Sardauna, and Gashaka recorded numerous violent conflicts causing significant destruction. These conflicts destroyed livelihoods and led to the desertion of economically active communities, displacing their populations.

The Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) December round 1 report identified approximately 389,281 displaced individuals, representing 60,232 households in the Nigerian Northeast State of Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba, and Yobe States. Yobe and Taraba had the highest numbers, with 125,991 and 81,790 displaced individuals, respectively. The DTM round VIII of 2016 reported the highest number of displaced individuals, totalling 2,241,484, representing 334,608 households across twelve states, including Taraba. By December 2017, the DTM round XX recorded 1,702,680 displaced individuals. The February 2018 round XXI reported 1,782,490 displaced individuals, representing 339,037 households in the northeast geopolitical zone of Nigeria. According to this report, Taraba State had 63,272 IDPs resulting from conflicts between 2010 and 2015. Insurgent attacks by Boko Haram and communal clashes were major factors contributing to the internal population displacement (DTM, 2014 & 2018).

In response to the humanitarian crises in the Northeast, the federal government launched the North East Food Security and Livelihood Emergency Support Project (NEFSLESP) under

Fadama III-AF-II to provide rapid response to humanitarian crises, activate economic activities, and reconstruct regions devastated by insurgency and violent conflicts. Funded by the World Bank and implemented by the Nigerian government, this programme seeks to enhance agricultural productivity, food security, and rural infrastructure development, providing essential support to rural communities, including IDPs and other vulnerable groups. The programme addresses rural development by offering financial support, agricultural inputs, training, and infrastructural improvements. Its objectives include improving livelihoods, promoting economic diversification, and reducing poverty (World Bank, 2020).

In Taraba State, the NEFSLESP implemented under FADAMA-III-AF-II developed a community action plan (CAP) that captured the basic needs of the IDPs, resettled, and host communities through a needs assessment approach. This is because identifying and addressing basic development needs is crucial for the well-being and economic stability of communities, especially in regions facing displacement and socio-economic challenges.

Basic development needs encompass essential services and provisions necessary for individuals and communities to achieve a minimum standard of living and well-being. These include shelter and housing, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), food security and nutrition, healthcare services, education, livelihoods and economic opportunities, protection and security, social and community integration, and infrastructure and public services. Meeting these needs is crucial for promoting human dignity, improving quality of life, building resilience among vulnerable populations, contributing to broader social and economic development goals and laying a foundation for sustainable growth and stability, especially in communities ravaged by conflict (UNHCR, 2014; UNDP, 2014).

Conversely, intervention involves taking action to improve social causes and resolve disorder. Social disorders are common situations affecting society. Implementing policies to address and prevent the escalation of these disorders is an act of intervention. This involves a systematic process of assessment and planning to remedy humanitarian problems, which can be social, educational, or developmental. In areas affected by insurgency and violent conflict, addressing humanitarian crises through intervention has become a global concern as represented by the Brookings Institution policy (2010) and the Kampala Convention (2009).

Intervention refers to the proactive delivery of humanitarian assistance, aimed at preserving lives, reducing suffering, and upholding human dignity in the aftermath of disasters or during widespread emergencies. Humanitarians, in this context, serve as caregivers, offering crucial support to affected communities (Bassey & Nta, 2022).

Balogun, et al (2020) further view intervention as strategies or programmes designed to bring about desirable changes in the behaviors of vulnerable groups or entire populations. These interventions can vary in pattern and objectives, including relief programmes, educational initiatives, development projects, environmental improvements, or health promotion services. The needs of displaced persons, especially those affected by violent conflict, are in significant proportion. Adopting different strategies to address these needs is considered the most effective approach for achieving durable solutions that meet international standards.

Enwereji (2009), as cited in Balogun, Okafor, Jimoh, and Abdulaziz (2020), also argues that interventions for displaced or resettled persons can be implemented in various settings, such as communities, workplaces, schools, healthcare organizations, faith-based organizations, or homes. This supports the idea that interventions should be multi-faceted and implemented in multiple settings to reach Jeremy Bentham's philosophy of the greatest happiness for the greatest number. Such approaches can create change by influencing individuals' knowledge, increasing social support, and creating supportive environments, policies, and resources (Balogun et al., 2020).

Intervention programmes that are development-oriented focus on areas such as housing, livelihoods, healthcare, education, counselling, skill building, advocacy, and social support. These services help displaced persons rebuild their lives and regain self-sufficiency (Kraemer et al. 2019). By international standards for managing internally displaced persons (IDPs), and guidelines for finding durable solutions for IDPs, governments, civil society organizations, international aid agencies, and host communities are expected to plan programmes to support IDPs in resettling and recovering their livelihoods. The intervention process must be result-oriented and effective, playing a critical role in the successful return, reintegration, and resettlement of displaced persons. Therefore, it is essential to align basic needs with intervention programmes.

From the foregoing background, the objective of this study is to establish whether there is a correlation between the basic needs identified by the FADAMA-III-AF-II and the actual intervention packages delivered. By examining how well the programme meets identified needs, this study contributes to understanding how targeted interventions can effectively address basic development needs. The paper is organised into five sections, namely introduction, review of preceding literature on development needs and intervention programme and hypotheses development, methodology, results and discussion, and conclusion.

2. Theoretical framework and hypotheses development

2.1 Development needs and intervention programme

Several empirical studies have examined the development needs among displaced persons and intervention programmes. In 2017, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) (2017) surveyed the needs of IDPs, returnees, and host communities in Yemen, finding that food was the highest priority across all groups. IDPs also prioritized shelter, housing, and financial support, while host populations needed food and health assistance. Returnees and non-displaced individuals focused on income and financial support. This study's focus on basic needs aligns with the current research, which also examines whether these needs are met by the intervention programme, though the current study differs in establishing the correlation between the basic needs and the intervention programme provided.

Shodeinde and Otabor (2018) conducted a qualitative study on IDP social integration in Nigeria, highlighting NGO contributions such as shelter, food, financial aid, and health assistance. They noted the negative psychological impact of displacement and the need for infrastructural development. However, challenges such as inadequate resources and security issues impeded effective resettlement. Their study differs from the current research in its focus

on social integration and NGOs, whereas the current study examines government-led intervention programmes as they relate to the needs of the resettled IDPs.

Balogun et al. (2020) researched IDP intervention programmes in Northwest Nigeria, using a descriptive cross-sectional survey. They identified gaps between IDPs' social needs and actual provisions, focusing on financial support, job opportunities, and necessities. Their study, which uses conflict theory, aligns with the current research's focus on intervention programmes but differs in scope as the present study focuses on general development needs. Therefore, we postulate a hypothesis that:

H₁: There is a significant relationship between the development needs and intervention programme among resettled internally displaced communities in Taraba State.

3. Methodology

This study employs a descriptive research design using questionnaires to collect data, to understand the correlation between the basic development needs of resettled internally displaced communities and the Fadama-III-AF-II intervention programme in Taraba State. The state, affected by the Boko Haram insurgency and ethno-religious conflicts, received support through the NEFSLESP intervention, impacting 67 communities and 2,680 households (Fadama III-AF-II, 2018). The study population consisted of 1,560 individuals from 39 resettled communities, each with 40 beneficiaries of the NEFSLESP intervention for 2016-2017. Due to security concerns, 26 communities that had not experienced intense threats were selected, resulting in a study population of 1,040.

A multi-stage sampling technique was used. First, stratified sampling categorized IDPs into 39 strata based on their communities. Second, purposive sampling selected 26 communities without renewed conflict. Third, NEFSLESP beneficiaries were purposively identified in each community with the help of community youth leaders and programme facilitators. Fourth, questionnaires were administered using random sampling. The sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan's formula as cited in Bukhari (2020). The result is a sample size of 336 from a population of 1,040. The sample size for each community was calculated proportionally which resulted in 13 respondents in each of the 26 communities since they all have equal beneficiaries (40 each), giving a total of 338.

A 3-part questionnaire was administered to the 338 beneficiaries. The questionnaire covered socio-economic characteristics, basic development needs, and received intervention packages, using a two-point Likert scale. Descriptive statistics analysed the data, and a hypothesis was tested using the correlation coefficient at a 0.05 alpha level to measure the relationship between variables.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1. Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Period of Displacement			Period of Resettlement			Needs Assessment		
Period	Frequency	Percentage	Period	Frequency	Percentage	Option	Frequency	Percentage
2010-2011	0.0	0%	2016-2017	158	46.7%	Yes	324	95.80%
2012-2013	11	3.30%	2018-2019	180	53.3%	No	6	1.80%
2014-2015	171	50.60%	2020-2021	0.0	0.00%	Not sure	8	2.40%
2016-2017	156	46.10%						

Source: *Field Survey 2023*

Table 1 describes the period of displacement, resettlement, and needs assessment of the communities within the study area. The period between 2014-2015 witnessed displacement of 171 individuals constituting 50.6%, and between 2016-2017, the figure stands at 156 individuals, which constitute 46.1% of the people that were further displaced. This shows that the majority of the displacement took place between 2014 and 2017.

The dataset on the period of resettlement and voluntary return within resettled internally displaced communities in Taraba State in Table 1 delineates the aspects of individuals resettling or voluntarily returning to their original communities. The majority of the respondents (53.3%) agreed that their resettlement took place between 2018 and 2019. Again, 46.7% of the respondents submitted that their resettlement was between 2016-2017. The predominant numbers in 2018-2019 and 2016-2017 indicate a substantial influx of individuals resettling or voluntarily returning to their homes during these periods.

The data regarding the needs assessment within resettled internally displaced communities in Taraba State in Table 1 reflects a strong consensus, with 95.8% affirmatives for the need assessment. This finding shows that the majority of the respondent agree that the need assessment was carried out by the Fadama office where their needs were identified before the delivery of intervention packages.

The distribution of the period of displacement by resettled internally displaced communities in Taraba State revealed the temporal aspects of their displacement experiences. The finding shows that 2014-2015 and 2016-2017 witnessed the highest level of displacement of people from their communities. This suggests that the bulk of the displacement occurred more prominently from 2014 onwards, with a considerable number displaced during these years. This finding corroborates the Displacement Tracking Matrix (2014) and (2018) which also found that within these periods, 389,281 people were displaced in Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe States. The report especially showed Yobe and Taraba States having the majority of displaced persons, 125,991 and 81,790, respectively.

In 2016, the DTM round VIII further revealed that about 2,241,484 were also displaced in the twelve states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Taraba, Yobe, Nasarawa, Plateau, Kaduna, Kano, Zamfara and the Federal Capital. The magnitude of displacement in the country within these timeframes helps account for the series of both governmental and non-governmental assistance programmes to address the evolving needs and circumstances of individuals and families affected by the displacement events. This further aligns with the Brookings Institution (2010) of providing safety, restoration, and economic recovery to the victims of displacement.

Findings on the years of resettlement and voluntary return denote the specific timeframes when communities experienced higher rates of return or re-establishment, signifying potential milestones or periods of heightened activity related to resettlement efforts. The predominant numbers in 2016-2017 (158 individuals) and 2018-2019 (180 individuals) indicate a substantial influx of individuals resettling or voluntarily returning to their homes during these periods. From the displacement period between 2014-2015 and 2016-2017 to the resettlement period between 2016-2019, this potentially indicates the length of time individuals have been

separated from their original homes or communities. Resettlement is adjudged by the Brookings Institution (2010) to be the sustainable return and local integration of internally displaced persons. Resettlement is further sustained by the Kampala convention (2009) provision as the lasting solution to the problem of displacement, where the IDPs' right is protected to voluntarily choose to return to his/her community, integrate locally in areas of displacement or relocate to another part of the country. Ikwuyatum (2016), however, added that such a return should be accompanied by livelihood empowerment for a dignified life, hence the intervention exercise carried out by Fadama-III-AF-II.

To effectively identify the development needs of beneficiaries in intervention programmes, a needs assessment is essential. Findings indicate that Fadama III-AF-II's interventions were demand-driven, using a bottom-up approach to assess and address the specific needs, challenges, and resources of resettled communities. This process brings out the importance of understanding community conditions to design and implement effective interventions. Human development theories support this approach, highlighting that involving communities in decision-making fosters dialogue, social cohesion, and responsiveness to their needs. Conducting needs assessments allows beneficiaries to participate in planning and implementation, promoting community development.

Table 2. Basic development needs

S/No	Variables	Yes	No	Total	Ranking
1	Food assistance	338(100%)	0(0.0%)	338(100.0%)	1 st
2	Shelter and houses	261(77.2%)	77(22.8%)	338(100.0%)	11 th
3	Building Materials (Zinc, cement, woods, etc)	265(78.4%)	73(21.6%)	338(100.0%)	10 th
4	Improve health care facilities and delivery	338(100%)	0(0.0%)	338(100.0%)	1 st
5	Provision of Agric inputs (seeds, fertilizer, insecticide, pesticides,)	337(99.7%)	1(0.3%)	338(100.0%)	2 nd
6	Farming implements (sprayer, tiller etc)	325(96.2%)	13(3.8%)	338(100.0%)	5 th
7	Provision of livestock	298(88.2%)	40(11.8%)	338(100.0%)	6 th
8	Rehabilitation of community roads and bridges	330(97.6%)	8(2.4%)	338(100.0%)	3 rd
9	Rehabilitation of community market square and warehouses	187(55.3%)	151(44.7%)	338(100.0%)	12 th
10	Entrepreneurial and vocational training	284(84.0%)	54(16.0%)	338(100.0%)	8 th
11	Rehabilitation of school facilities	329(97.3%)	9(2.7%)	338(100.0%)	4 th
12	Provision of community source of water	290(85.8%)	48(14.2%)	338(100.0%)	7 th
13	Provision of job (casual labour work, farming, well construction, trade, tailoring, etc)	274(81.1%)	64(18.9%)	338(100.0%)	9 th

Source: *Field Survey 2023.*

The data presented in Table 2 show that food assistance and improved healthcare facilities and delivery were rated first with 100% each. Provision of agricultural inputs (99.7%), rehabilitation of community roads and bridges (97.6%), rehabilitation of school facilities (97.2%); and provision of farming implements (96.2%) were indicated as requirements for meaningful resettlement with 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th rating respectively.

Other factors include the provision of livestock (88.2%) which was rated 6th, provision of community source of water (85.8%) came 7th in the rating, entrepreneurial and vocational training (84.0%) was rated 8th, provision of jobs (casual labour work, farming, well construction, trade, tailoring, etc.) (81.1%) rating was 9th, building materials (Zinc, cement, woods, etc.) (78.4%) was rated 10th, shelter and houses (77.2%) were rated 11th and rehabilitation of community market square and warehouses was rated (55.3%) 12th. It is imperative to state that all the variables are of significance to the issue of development within the resettled communities since none of them has affirmative responses of less than 50 per cent. This cohesive consensus underscores the critical nature of these developmental requisites as perceived by the resettled internally displaced communities, reinforcing the essentiality of these interventions before resettlement for their rehabilitation, sustained well-being, and development.

Assessing essential development needs before resettlement is crucial for outlining the fundamental requirements for successful rehabilitation. This understanding ensures a sustainable resettlement process for displaced communities. The study identified critical needs such as food assistance, healthcare, agricultural inputs, infrastructure rehabilitation, educational facilities, farming implements, housing, building materials, livestock, vocational training, water sources, and job opportunities. These insights align with the priorities of resettled communities and facilitate targeted intervention strategies.

The findings are consistent with IOM and UNHCR (2017), which identified basic needs like food, shelter, financial support, and healthcare for displaced people. Similarly, Balogun, Okafor, Jimoh, and Abdulaziz (2020) emphasized the need for financial support, employment, training, personal safety, healthcare, counseling, shelter, clothing, and sufficient food and cooking materials for displaced persons.

Table 3. Intervention packages received

S/N	Intervention Packages	Received	Not Received	Total
i	Food Assistance	307(90.8%)	31(9.2%)	338 (100%)
ii	Agric inputs:			
	Fertilizer	195(57.7%)	143(42.3%)	338 (100%)
	Chemical	127(37.6%)	211(62.4%)	338 (100%)
	Pesticides	204(60.4%)	134(39.6%)	338 (100%)
	Insecticides	203(60.1%)	135(39.9%)	338 (100%)
	Others (Specify):			
iii	Planting Seeds:			
	Rice	93(27.5%)	245(72.5%)	338 (100%)
	Maize	100(30.5%)	238(69.5%)	338 (100%)
	Yam	30(8.9%)	308(91.1%)	338 (100%)
iv	Small Agricultural Implement:			
	Sprayer	187(55.3%)	151(44.7%)	338 (100%)
	Water pump	16(4.7%)	322(95.3%)	338 (100%)
	Fishing gear	0(0.0%)	338(100%)	338 (100%)
v	a Provision of Livestock	204(60.4%)	134(39.6%)	338 (100%)
	b Feed/drugs	149(44.1%)	189(55.9%)	338 (100%)

vii	Feeder roads/bridge/ culvert Construction	145(42.9%)	193(57.1%)	338 (100%)
viii	Entrepreneurial, business and vocational training	312(92.3%)	26(7.7%)	338 (100%)
ix	Community Warehouses/lock up stores	161(47.6%)	177(52.4%)	338 (100%)
x	Community market	13(3.8%)	325(96.2%)	338 (100%)
xi	Cash for work	127(37.6%)	211(62.4%)	338 (100%)
xii	Sinking of Borehole	31(9.2%)	307(90.8%)	338 (100%)

Source: *Field Survey 2023*

The data in Table 3 reveals the distribution of received and not received intervention packages within internally displaced communities in Taraba State. On whether food assistance was given, the results show that the majority (90.8%) agreed while 9.2% disagreed. On agricultural inputs, the pesticide has the highest percentage of beneficiaries (60.4%) who agreed to receive it as against 39.6% who disagreed. This was followed by insecticides where 60.1% said yes and 39.9% said no. Fertilizer followed with 57.7% agreed, and 42.3%) disagreed. Chemicals received the least affirmative response amongst them with 37.6% affirmative and 62.4% negative responses.

On the issue of, if planting seeds were provided, the answers show that maize has the highest number of beneficiaries with 30.5% agreeing and 69.5% not agreeing. For rice, a majority (72.5%) said they did not receive while 27.5% said they received rice for planting. Responses of beneficiaries further show that for yam seedlings, 91.1% said they did not receive it while only 8.9% agreed to receive it. This shows that the larger of the beneficiaries do not receive seedlings for planting.

The findings also show that the beneficiaries were given small agricultural implements for farming. Sprayer and water pump, were the basic implements delivered. However, the results reveal that only a few benefited from these packages. 55.3% overwhelmingly agreed to receive a sprayer while 44.7% disagreed. For the water pump, 95.3 disagreed with receiving it as against the 4.7% that agreed to receive the package. The implication is that not all farm implements were provided and only a sprayer was relatively provided in quantity.

Another component of the intervention provided was livestock along with feeds and drugs. Amongst this classification were goats, Cattle, Sheep, Poultry, and feed/drugs. The results show that majority 60.4% were given livestock of different types. For the feed/drugs, the majority (55.9%) disagreed with received, while 44.1% responded otherwise. Again, this also shows that not all resettled internally displaced persons got livestock/feed/drugs as an intervention.

Infrastructural facilities were also provided particularly for the communities. These include feeder roads/bridges/culverts, community Warehouses/lock-up stores, community markets, and boreholes. The results reveal that the majority of the sample population disagreed with receiving infrastructural facilities while few agreed to receive construction of community facilities from the intervention. Warehouse/lock-up stores and feeder roads/bridge/culvert construction stand out to be the two facilities with the highest affirmative responses of 47.6% and 42.9% respectively. Sinking boreholes and rehabilitation of the community market received

the lowest responses of 9.2% and 3.8%. This indicated that more communities benefited from warehouse/lock-up stores and feeder roads/bridge/culvert construction.

Other aspects of the intervention packages were entrepreneurial, business and vocational training and cash for work. While a majority of the sampled population agreed that they were given entrepreneurial and vocational training, only a few of them agreed to receive cash for work to improve their daily income level. Specifically, 92.3% of the beneficiaries received training while 7.7% disagreed with ever receiving any kind of training. As a strategy for improving the daily income of the beneficiaries, community services were engaged and participants were given cash. 62.4% of the respondents disagreed with receiving any cash while, 37.6% agreed.

The assessment of basic needs identified several variables, though some such as rehabilitation of school facilities, provision of shelter and houses, medical care, and building materials were not included in the intervention packages. This indicates a significant correlation between identified needs and received intervention packages. A demand-driven approach helps understand community challenges and resources, fostering community ownership and development.

Shodeinde and Otabor (2018) supported findings on feeding and finance for IDPs, though their study also included shelter, clothing, counseling, informal education, and health support, which were not provided in the Fadama-III-AF-II intervention. Similarly, Ajala and Ayanbimpe (2019) noted food, water, and educational training, but differed on health services and security, which were absent in Fadama's intervention. Balogun et al. (2020) identified raw food, shelter, relief materials, security services, health programs, and information centers, with only raw food aligning with this study.

Contrastingly, Eweka and Olusegun (2016) reported decent accommodation, health facilities, and self-employment for displaced persons. Godagama (2013) found inadequate attention to entrepreneurship, vocational training, and agricultural resources in Sri Lanka, which this study emphasized. Overall, the study confirms a positive and significant correlation between identified basic development needs and the Fadama-III-AF-II provided intervention packages, corroborating Balogun et al. (2020) on the correlation between IDP needs and interventions.

Table 4. Correlation Analysis between basic development needs and intervention programme

		Basic Development Needs	Intervention Programme
Basic Development Needs	Pearson Correlation	1	.604
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.018
	N	338	338
Intervention Programme	Pearson Correlation	.604	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.018	
	N	338	338

Source: *Field Survey*; September, 2023. Author's computation with SPSS 23

Summary of Statistics:

Reject H_0 : $r(338) = 0.604, p = .018$

This hypothesis was set to find out whether the intervention programme met the needs of the resettled internally displaced communities. The result showed that there is a statistically significant relationship between basic development needs and intervention programmes. From Table 4, our Pearson Correlation coefficient (0.604) and P value (0.018) give us the confidence to reach this decision, that the result of the finding does not support the Null hypothesis, therefore, we reject it. This confirms that intervention programmes play a crucial role in meeting basic development needs among IDPs. This shows their importance in social and economic development efforts.

5. Conclusion

The study found that the Fadama-III-AF-II intervention programme for resettled internally displaced communities was demand-driven, involving participatory engagement and needs assessment. Using a bottom-up approach, community responses were incorporated into a Community Action Plan (CAP), providing insights into challenges and resources for effective interventions. The needs assessment revealed critical pre-resettlement requirements. Most of the identified needs were addressed in the intervention packages, except for school facilities, shelter, medical care, and building materials. This established a significant correlation between identified needs and the received intervention packages.

Recommendations

Based on the key findings of this study, the following policy recommendations are made to address specific areas of improvement, foster community participation, and drive comprehensive, sustainable development within the internally displaced communities in Taraba State:

- i. The state government should design and channel intervention programmes to address housing, healthcare, and the rehabilitation of schools in resettled internally displaced communities.
- ii. The state government should design and implement vocational and capacity-building programmes that leverage the diverse occupational experiences within the community, fostering skill development and entrepreneurial opportunities. This should include business design support with credit, necessary facilities, and business extensions for those interested in self-employment in small businesses.
- iii. The state government and non-governmental organisations should develop specialised training initiatives in crop farming and livestock rearing, given their significant presence in the community's occupations.
- iv. There should be provisions for increased agricultural inputs by the state, leveraging the importance of crop and livestock farming for livelihood and food security. This will enable the expansion and cultivation of larger farm sizes for enhanced productivity.

References

- Balogun, A. O., Okafor, I. P., Jimoh, M. I., & Abdulaziz, I. (2020). Intervention programme for meeting the social needs of internally displaced persons in Northwest, Nigeria. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 9(1), 93-115.
- Bassey, I. E. & Nta E. E. (2022). Intervention in Nigeria: A Case of internally displaced People in Benue State, 2018 – 2021. *Humanus Discourse* 2(2); 1-15
- Brookings Institution (2010). IASC Framework on durable solutions for internally displaced persons, University of Bern: Project on Internal Displacement,

- Washington: the Brookings Institution <http://ochanet.unocha.org/p/Documents/IA-SC%...pdf>.
- Bukhari, S. A. R. (2020). *Sample Size Determination Using Krejcie and Morgan Table*. www.researchgate.net/publication/349118299_Sample_Size_Determination
- Displacement Tracking Matrix (2014). The IDP situation in the North-Eastern Nigeria, December, 2014. Report by International Organisation for Migration. www.nigeria.iom.int/dtm/26/3/2018.
- Displacement Tracking Matrix- DTM (2018). Round XXI report – Nigeria. Retrieved from <http://www.nigeria.iom.int/dtm>.
- Eweka, O., & Olusegun, T. O. (2016). Management of internally displaced persons in Africa: Comparing Nigeria and Cameroon. *African Research Review: An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia, 10*(1), 193-210. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrev.v10i1.15>.
- Fadama-III-AF-II (2018). Report on the implementation of North East Food Security and Livelihood Emergency Support Project (NEFSLESP) intervention programme in Taraba State
- Godagama, A. (2013). Role of interventions in improving quality of life of resettled IDPs: lessons of the Sri Lankan experiences. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce, 2*(8), 127-139 Retrieved from www.ijac.org.uk.
- Ikwuyatum, G. O. (2016). The Politics of Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in North Eastern Region of Nigeria. www.researchgate.net/publication/326995013
- International Organisation for Migration & United Nations High Commission for Refugees (2017). Multi-Cluster needs assessment of IDPs, Returnees and Host Communities in Yemen Task Force on Population Movement (TFPM). www.reliefweb.int/report/yemen/multi-cluster-needs-assessment-idps-returnees-and-host-communities
- Kampala Convention (2009). African Union convention for the protection and assistance of internally displaced persons in Africa. African Union Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC), Secretariat.
- Kraemer, H. C., Stice, E., Kazdin, A., Offord, D., & Kupfer, D. (2019). How do risk and protective factors work together? Overview of the Framework for Developing, Testing, and Implementing Complex Interventions. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 58*(1), 10-19
- Shodeinde, J., & Otabor, B. (2018). *Social integration of internally displaced person into the community: The role of non-governmental organization*. Thesis submitted to Diaconia University of Applied Sciences Helsinki.
- UNHCR. (2014). Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2014). Human Development Report 2014: Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience. New York. hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2014
- World Bank. (2020). FADAMA III AF II: Second Additional Financing for the Third National Fadama Development Project (P130788). <https://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P130788>